



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,974	03/03/2000	Steven V. Larson	13661-107	5719

7590

11/19/2001

Rider Bennet Egan & Arundel  
2000 Metropolitan Centre  
333 South 7th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

STRIMBU, GREGORY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3634

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2001

#7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/517,974

Applicant(s)

LARSON, STEVEN V.

Examiner

Gregory J. Strimbu

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 29 August 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3634

***Drawings***

The corrected or substitute drawings were received on August 29, 2001. These drawings are approved.

***Specification***

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. It is suggested that the applicant amend the title to include the gasket with anti-roll extensions as set forth in claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Recitations such as "withstand" on line 9 of claim 1 render the claims indefinite because it is unclear what the applicant is attempting to set forth. What comprises "withstand"? Is the applicant attempting to set forth that the door and frame do not allow air to pass therebetween or is the applicant attempting to set forth that the door and frame will remain relatively intact with a pressure differential of 6 inches. Recitations such as "six inches of air pressure" on lines 9-10 of claim 1 render the claims indefinite because it is unclear what the applicant is attempting to set forth. Air pressure is customarily measured in pounds per square inch, bars or atmospheres. Is the applicant referring to inches of mercury?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Ryan et al. McDonald discloses a door and frame combination, the combination comprising a frame 10, a hinged door 56 engaging the frame, the door 56 further comprising a front wall (not numbered), rear wall (not numbered), and side walls (not numbered) enclosing a hollow core (not numbered) and insulating material 66 filling the hollow core, and a gasket 52 between the door and the frame, the gasket further comprising a flexible gasket wall. The insulating material is a

Art Unit: 3634

polyurethane foam. The gasket includes a hollow central core (not numbered, but seen in figure 2). As shown in figure 1, the door includes a window (not numbered). The door and frame can withstand a pressure differential of up to six inches of air pressure. McDonald is silent concerning anti-roll extensions.

However, Ryan et al. discloses a gasket 10 for sealing between a door and a door frame having anti-roll extensions 15, 16, 17, 20 and 21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide McDonald with anti-roll extensions, as taught by Ryan et al., to improve the sealing between the door and the frame.

With respect to claims 3 and 10, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice for one with ordinary skill in the art to provide the side walls with a thickness of 2 inches to improve the insulating value of the door.

With respect to claims 7, 9 and 14, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice for one with ordinary skill in the art to manufacture the door with a high density polyurethane to improve the strength of the door or an expanding polyurethane foam to improve the insulating characteristics of the door.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 12 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuchs et al. in view of McDonald, Ryan et al. and Colliander. Fuchs et al. discloses door and frame combination, the combination comprising a frame 6, a

Art Unit: 3634

hinged door 1 engaging the frame, the door 1 further comprising a front wall 4, rear wall 5, and side walls (not numbered) enclosing a hollow core (not numbered) and a gasket 27, as shown in figure 2, between the door and the frame, the gasket further comprising a flexible gasket wall (not numbered). The door and frame can withstand a pressure differential of up to six inches of air pressure. Fuchs et al. is silent concerning anti-roll extensions, insulating material filling the hollow core and a friction reducing material.

However, McDonald disclose a door 56 comprising a polyurethane foam insulating material and a window in the door.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Fuchs et al. with an insulating material and a window, as taught by McDonald, to increase the insulating ability of the door.

Additionally, Ryan et al. disclose a gasket 10 for sealing between a door and a door frame having anti-roll extensions 15, 16, 17, 20 and 21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Fuchs et al. with anti-roll extensions, as taught by Ryan et al., to improve the sealing between the door and the frame.

Finally, Colliander disclose a gasket comprising a friction reducing material 21 on a gasket wall 19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Fuchs et al. with a friction reducing material, as taught by Colliander, to ensure the easy opening and closing of the door.

Art Unit: 3634

With respect to claim 9 it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice for one with ordinary skill in the art to manufacture the door with an expanding polyurethane foam to improve the insulating characteristics of the door.

With respect to claims 16 and 18, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice for one with ordinary skill in the art to use an expanding polyurethane foam to improve the insulating characteristics of the door or a high density polyurethane foam to improve the strength of the door and frame.

With respect to claim 20, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice for one with ordinary skill in the art to provide the side walls with a thickness of 2 inches to improve the insulating value of the door.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 29, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As noted in the 35 USC 112 rejection above, it is unclear what the applicant is attempting to set forth with the recitation "the door and frame can withstand a pressure differential of up to six inches of air pressure." Therefore, it is the examiner's position that the door and frame combination of either McDonald or Fuchs et al. meets the applicant's claim language since the doors can "withstand" air pressure.


Art Unit: 3634

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Strimbu whose telephone number is (703) 305-3979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3597. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.



Gregory J. Strimbu  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3634